```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA
 3
      DONALD HUMES,
                                     Case No. 2:17-cv-01778-JAD-DJA
 4
                  Plaintiff,
                                    ) Las Vegas, Nevada
 5
                                    ) May 21, 2021
      vs.
                                    ) 1:35 p.m. - 2:17 p.m.
 6
      ACUITY, A MUTUAL INSURANCE
                                   ) Courtroom 6B
      COMPANY, a foreign
                                   ) PRETRIAL HEARING
 7
      corporation; DOES 1 through
      10; and ROE CORPORATIONS 1
 8
      through 10, inclusive,
 9
                  Defendant.
                                     CERTIFIED COPY
10
11
                  REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JENNIFER A. DORSEY
12
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
13
14
      APPEARANCES:
15
      For the Plaintiff: CARA M. XIDIS, ESQ.
                          JUSTIN W. WILSON, ESQ.
16
                          H&P LAW
                          8950 West Tropicana Avenue, Suite 1
17
                          Las Vegas, Nevada 89147
                           (702) 598-4529
18
19
      (Appearances continued on page 2.)
2.0
21
                         Amber M. McClane, RPR, CRR, CCR #914
      Court Reporter:
                         United States District Court
22
                         333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Room 1334
                         Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
23
                         (702) 384-0429 or AM@nvd.uscourts.gov
24
      Proceedings reported by machine shorthand. Transcript
      produced by computer-aided transcription.
25
```

```
1
      APPEARANCES CONTINUED:
 2
      For the Defendant:
 3
           MARISSA R. TEMPLE, ESQ.
           STEPHEN H. ROGERS, ESQ.
 4
           ROGERS, MASTRANGELO, CARVALHO & MITCHELL
           700 South Third Street
           Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 5
           (702) 383-3400
 6
 7
      Also Present:
 8
           Summer Rivera, Jury Services Coordinator
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; FRIDAY, MAY 21, 2021; 1:35 P.M.
 1
 2
                                 --000--
                          PROCEEDINGS
 3
 4
               COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Now's the time set for a
 5
      jury questionnaire hearing in Case Number
 6
      2:17-cv-1778-JAD-DJA, Donald Humes versus Acuity, a Mutual
 7
      Insurance Company.
 8
               Counsel, please state your appearances.
 9
              MS. XIDIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Cara Xidis for
10
      the plaintiff.
               MR. WILSON: And Justin Wilson for the plaintiff as
11
12
     well.
13
              MS. TEMPLE: And Marissa Temple for the defendant.
14
              MR. ROGERS: And Steve Rogers also.
15
               THE COURT: All right. Are the four of you
16
      intending -- you're going to be the four lawyers at trial; is
17
      that right?
18
              MS. XIDIS: Yes, Your Honor.
19
              MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor.
2.0
               THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. All right. In just a
21
      minute we will get to the jury questionnaires, but before I do
22
      that, just a couple issues.
23
               One, I have your briefing on the motions to strike
24
      and an order on those motions is forthcoming. I just -- I
25
      just finished a jury trial last night, so -- and you just
```

2:17-cv-01778-JAD-DJA - May 21, 2021

filed the responses at noon today. So those -- I expect that that will get out today.

I want to talk now about jury instructions. As I flagged for you I think it was Monday, there are concerns I have with the jury instructions because they are based on Nevada law, not South Dakota law, which there's an order in this case that says this case is governed by South Dakota law.

So no one has given me South Dakota law jury instructions, and so you have two options right now. One, you can either stipulate that Nevada law applies, or you need to submit to me jury instructions that are based on South Dakota law. Those are the two choices that we have here. I need you guys to talk, figure out which way this is going to go. And if the answer is that it's going to be South Dakota law as it currently stands, then you need to -- you need to provide me with a new set of jury instructions. And I also don't know which ones you agree on and which ones you dispute at this point.

So I need two things, and I'm going to give you till Sunday at 5:00 p.m. to get this taken care of. So you can either file a stipulation that Nevada law applies, and then you don't have to submit additional jury instructions based -- I'm sorry, did I say Nevada? Yes. Then you don't have to submit additional jury instructions that are based on South Dakota law. Or you can find the case law or the law or the

jury instructions that apply South Dakota law and provide those. Either way, I also need a joint set of agreed upon jury instructions and then the instructions that you disagree on. So you need to get together on these issues.

Does that make sense?

2.0

So I need to know -- I need to be able to say, okay, they all agree on these -- you know, most of them are really -- should be agreed on. They're form instructions. They should be agreed on. Ninth Circuit model civil jury instructions. They should -- so many basic ones that are not case specific. You should be able to at a minimum agree on that, but you should also be able to agree on -- this is a breach of contract case. This should not be complicated. It should be quite simple about which jury instructions apply. So agree on the ones you can, and then provide to me the ones you cannot agree on and let me know that those are the ones that you dispute. I need all of that done, filed by 5:00 p.m. on Sunday.

During voir dire, I am going to explain to the parties -- not to the parties -- to the jury -- jurors what this case is about, and this is what I propose to tell them: This is a civil lawsuit between Donald Humes and Acuity, a Mutual Insurance Company, about Acuity's alleged failure to cover Mr. Humes' medical expenses after a 2013 car accident. Mr. Humes and Acuity agree that Mr. Humes purchased an

```
insurance policy from Acuity and that his policy provides him
 1
 2
      underinsured motorist coverage, but they dispute whether the
 3
      accident caused his injuries, whether the medical care he
 4
      received was necessary to treat his injuries, and the
 5
      reasonable charges for any necessary treatments.
 6
               Any objections? I'll ask the plaintiff first.
 7
               MS. XIDIS: Yes, Your Honor. Most of it sounds fine.
 8
      My only concern is that you've limited it to medical
 9
      expenses -- perhaps unintentionally -- which leaves out the
10
      general damages.
11
               THE COURT: All right. Damages instead of medical
12
      expenses?
               MS. XIDIS: I would be comfortable with that.
13
14
               THE COURT: So alleged failure to cover Mr. Humes'
15
      damages after -- excuse me -- after a 2013 car accident, but
16
      then the rest of it where they dispute whether the accident
17
      caused his injuries, when the medical care he received was
18
      necessary to treat his injuries, and the reasonable charges
19
      for any necessary treatments, do you have a proposed change to
2.0
      any of that?
21
               MS. XIDIS: No, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
23
               MS. TEMPLE: No changes, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to replace "medical
25
      expenses" with "damages," and that will be the summary that I
```

read.

2.0

Just looking -- just in prepping for this case, I know we had talked last at calendar call that we're going to seat eight jurors. We only need six to decide the case. So essentially there's two alternates but they aren't treated as alternates. They're just part of the people who will be deciding, part of the jury. So we could lose up to two and still go to verdict with this case. So even if we lose one and have seven, that doesn't -- that's fine under both the rule and the statute.

The parties get a total of six peremptory challenges; three each. So that means that we really have to focus on 14 people in the box in order to start our questioning process, and then as we lose someone from the 14, we excuse someone, we'll pull somebody from the rest of the jury -- rest of the venire to replace them. So I think -- and I see Summer, our Jury Services representative, here today. I think we'll probably just do 14 in the box so that we're clear, and then spread out whatever's left.

What do you think, Summer?

MS. RIVERA: I think that's fine because we can fit 32 total with the 14 and the 18. Because three, six, nine, 18. So we don't need to use an overflow courtroom.

THE COURT: Oh great. That makes sense. Okay.

Well, wait. Hold on. So we're going to just do 32

```
1
      but...
 2
               COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: We pre-seat 14 per side.
 3
               THE COURT:
                          I know. We pre-seat 14, and then we can
 4
      sit everybody else. But do we have more than 32 that are
 5
      coming, Summer?
 6
              MS. RIVERA: So on the list that I sent you, there
 7
      was more than -- we're shooting for 30. But depending on how
 8
      many we get rid of, we're just going to bring in the first 30
 9
      so it gave the attorneys flexibility to excuse up to --
10
               THE COURT: Got it. Are you going to keep any
11
      overflows down in Jury Services?
12
              MS. RIVERA: I was not planning on it. I was just
13
      only calling in 30, and they will all come up here.
               THE COURT: Okay. So I think you provided us the
14
15
      jury questionnaires 1 through 99ish?
16
              MS. RIVERA: Yes, that's correct.
17
               THE COURT: And is that just 30 people?
18
              MS. RIVERA: No. I think that was 44 people.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. So how many people will show up
2.0
     here?
21
               MS. RIVERA: So I'm planning -- I'm going to call in
22
     more than 30 because we usually have about three to five that
23
      don't show up. So I plan on calling 32 hoping to get as close
24
      to 30 as possible.
               THE COURT: Can we do 35?
25
```

```
MS. RIVERA: Yes.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: All right. Let's call in 35. So our
 3
      first 35 of the questionnaires are who we will be calling in;
 4
      right?
 5
               MS. RIVERA: That's correct.
 6
               THE COURT: Okav.
 7
               MS. RIVERA: And then if we do have more than 35 or
 8
      if all 35 show up, then I can keep the three that won't fit
 9
      into the courtroom downstairs in the jury room.
10
               THE COURT: Perfect. Thank you. You've answered my
11
      questions.
12
               All right. So why don't we go ahead then -- I'll ask
13
      the lawyers, let's go ahead and turn to the jury
14
      questionnaires, which I find extremely helpful during jury
15
      selection. It really shaves down the time. I don't re-ask
16
      the questions in the questionnaires.
17
               So the reason they're in the questionnaires is
18
      because these are standardish questions. Granted, some of
19
      them are just criminal directed, but some of them are civil
2.0
      directed.
21
               So let's -- my intention of this hearing this morning
22
      is -- this morning? -- this afternoon is to just go through
23
      any people that you think we should not bring to the
24
      courthouse for -- for one reason or another that you think
25
      that they will be -- they should be excluded for cause right
```

now.

2.0

And I will tell you, I don't think that's very many. I think it's just a couple based on what I've looked at, and typically it's a significant scheduling situation where they can't be here.

You should also know that we -- so Jury Services has the discretion under a -- the Court's general orders and also under our jury plan, when someone from the jury pool has contacted Jury Services and said I need to postpone, this date doesn't work for me, or I have no childcare or I don't have transportation or there's some specific reason that they ask to be excused, Jury Services has the ability to do that. And so there have been people in the jury pool that was called for this case who have been excused for those reasons that the general order and the jury plan allow.

These jury questionnaires that you have don't include any of the people who have already been excused for those reasons. So these are the ones we need to sort through and finish up today.

So I'm going to just talk about the handful that I've found, and then I'll go to each side and see if there's any that you propose to be excused for cause before they even show up here on Monday.

My first one is Number 3. So it's pool sequence
Number 3, and then there's that long participant number. But

I'm just using the pool sequence number. 1 2 This person says -- has answered question Number 7 3 affirmatively and explained they have a mother that recently 4 had surgery who is in need of assistance since she's confined 5 to a wheelchair, and this person takes care of the mother from 6 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. once the caregiver leaves. 7 Trial will go till 5:00. So somebody who has to be 8 taking care of someone at 3:00 p.m. is not going to work out 9 for us. So any objection to me excusing Juror Number 3 for 10 cause? 11 MS. XIDIS: No, Your Honor. 12 MS. TEMPLE: No. 13 THE COURT: Okay. My next one is Juror Number 9. Same question, Number 7. Answer: Between my job and running 14 15 a business, I also have to help my wife all the time to take care of her and the kids. She suffers from debilitating 16 17 migraine due to her brain aneurysm surgery. 18 It sounds like it's possibly a temporary situation so 19 maybe we could postpone this person, but I'm not certain of 2.0 that. Does anyone have an objection to me excusing this 21 person for cause? 22 MS. XIDIS: No, Your Honor. 23 MS. TEMPLE: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Those are my only two. I'm going 25 to move to the plaintiff. Do you have any additional ones

that you think should be excused for cause at this point 1 2 before we even bring them in? 3 MS. XIDIS: I believe that Number 46 have indicated 4 that he was concerned about spreading COVID back to his 5 parents who are high risk. I would propose excusing him or 6 her. 7 THE COURT: Yeah. So this one said both parents have 8 recovered from major surgery within the past six months, but 9 then answered to 10(a), "If yes, will you be able to serve as 10 a juror?" And the answer was yes. So just concerned about 11 going to a public area and bringing anything back to my 12 parents. 13 What we can't tell is whether this person lives with the parents, and I had a handful of these in my trial this 14 15 week. And, really, most of these people were comfortable once 16 they saw we have Plexiglas, we have mask requirements, and we 17 have social distancing. So I would be disinclined -- as long 18 they answered that, yes, they would be able to serve as a 19 juror, I'm disinclined to excuse them right now. So I'm going 2.0 to deny that one. Thank you. 21 MS. XIDIS: Okay. 22 THE COURT: Next one? 23 MS. XIDIS: Let me -- some of them are on the same 24 basis, so give me just a minute so I'm not --25 THE COURT: Absolutely. Take your time. Just tell

```
1
      me when you're ready.
 2
               MS. XIDIS: Number 50 indicates that she is a
 3
      caregiver of a disabled -- and this is in response to Question
 4
      7(a) -- of a disabled elderly lady with MS living in the home
 5
      who relies on her to assist with activities of daily living
 6
      and meal prep. I would suggest excusing her as well.
 7
               THE COURT: The answer to Number 8 is problematic,
 8
      too.
               MS. XIDIS: Correct.
 9
10
               THE COURT: A medical disability that would make it
      difficult to serve as a juror: Chronic lower back pain,
11
12
      taking prescription medication, have been out of work
13
      recently, going back full time this week, has no vacation
14
      time, going to jury duty will be a financial hardship, already
15
      behind on rent.
16
               Any objection to me excusing this one for cause?
17
               MS. XIDIS: No, Your Honor.
18
               MS. TEMPLE: No, Your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: All right. We'll excuse Number 50 for
2.0
      cause also.
21
               Next one?
22
               MS. XIDIS: Number 64 with respect to Questions 8 and
23
      10 indicated that his or her diabetes could affect her -- his
24
      or her ability to sit on a jury.
25
               MS. TEMPLE:
                            I'm sorry, did you say 64?
```

MS. XIDIS: Yes, Number 64. 1 2 THE COURT: Yeah. I think this one I'm going to need 3 more follow up on just because I can't -- I don't -- diabetes 4 alone I don't think gets us there. Maybe complications from 5 would, but we'll -- we'll have to follow up on that and see if 6 this is someone who has some situation that makes it so they 7 can't sit still or need to keep running to the bathroom or 8 something like that. So we'll follow up on this one. Thank 9 you. I'll just make a note. We'll follow up on this one at 10 jury selection. 11 Next one? 12 MS. XIDIS: No, Your Honor. I think the other ones 13 are ones we can deal with through follow up. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Great. 15 Any others from the defense? 16 MR. ROGERS: Yes, Your Honor. Just one moment. 17 We're discussing this. 18 Okay. Your Honor, I'm second-chairing this. I'm 19 Steve Rogers, but Ms. Temple has asked me to talk to you about 2.0 this. 21 Okay. Number 20 raised some issues in response to 22 those questions we're focusing on, beginning with Number 8. 23 THE COURT: Number 20. Okay. MR. ROGERS: And I understand that we're focused 24 25 primarily on scheduling hardship, disability, and

COVID-related issues. There were some additional 1 2 philosophical concerns. They do seem to relate more to the 3 criminal justice system. 4 THE COURT: Um-hum. 5 MR. ROGERS: But still it appeared that there was 6 enough here to raise some concern for cause. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Yeah. This person says they're a 8 crime reporter and has apparently a lot of concerns about the 9 criminal justice system that are raised and has PTSD from 10 covering the October 1st shooting. 11 I think that this is somebody who we definitely need 12 to follow up on, but I don't see cause at this point. 13 MR. ROGERS: Okay. Okay. Next was Number 43. THE COURT: Okay. 14 15 MR. ROGERS: It was someone with a hearing deficit. 16 THE COURT: All right. So this person says they have 17 a hearing loss and they wear a hearing aid. This is one we'll 18 follow up on, too. We also have special hearing devices that 19 are right there next to Danielle. You can see those little 2.0 headphone sets. So if someone does have a hearing deficit, we 21 can -- we have ways to assist them so that they can 22 participate in this process. 23 MR. ROGERS: Got it. Okay. Number 56 expressed concerns about COVID but did seem 24 25 to back off those concerns. That may fall within the

```
1
      follow-up category.
 2
               THE COURT: Yes. So this person said that they have
 3
      stage IV kidney failure, diabetic, hypertensive, but has been
 4
     vaccinated and has said that they can serve as a juror. So we
 5
     will -- we can ask them about that and make sure that they're
 6
     comfortable, but it looks like they don't have -- in fact the
 7
     next one says no concerns. So we'll bring them in.
 8
               MR. ROGERS: Okay. And finally, 73 had some COVID
 9
      concerns for their parents. That may fall within the umbrella
10
     we've already discussed.
11
               THE COURT: Right. So, if yes, will you be able to
12
      serve as a juror? Yes. And so we'll follow up with this one
13
     as well because they have said that they could serve. So we
14
     will bring them in.
15
              MR. ROGERS: Okay. That's all on my list.
16
               THE COURT: Wonderful.
               All right. So that means 3, 9, and 50 are the three
17
18
     that I'm showing. Danielle, do you have the same list?
               COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Yes, Your Honor.
19
2.0
               THE COURT: All right. Did you get it, Summer?
21
              MS. RIVERA: I got it.
22
               THE COURT: All right. So we will excuse for cause
23
      3, 9, and 50, and they will not be part of the group that we
24
     will see here on Monday.
25
              MS. RIVERA: All right. Your Honor, and so it looks
```

like we will cut it off close to Number 64. 1 2 THE COURT: Oh. Great. 3 MS. RIVERA: So I'm going to go double-check that 4 downstairs, but pretty much I think everyone after 64 will be 5 excused. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks, Summer. 7 MS. RIVERA: Thank you. 8 THE COURT: Have a good weekend. 9 MS. RIVERA: You, too. 10 (Summer Rivera exits the proceedings.) 11 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else I need 12 to address then while we're all here? 13 MS. TEMPLE: We do have one other issue, Your Honor, and it is kind of impacting our ability to complete the jury 14 15 instructions. We tried to reach a stipulation, and then we 16 thought collectively it might be better to check with 17 Your Honor. I know you've handle this issue before because I 18 was peripherally involved with a case that you heard the 19 issue. 2.0 We've got a stipulation in place. There's no dispute 21 on the -- that the contract was in force. I think you can 22 tell that from the pleadings. There's no dispute that the --23 of the contract amount. There's no dispute that Mr. Humes was 24 an insured under the contract. There's no coverage defenses 25 raised. There's no dispute on the offset amount. We've

agreed on what the setoff would be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The -- so the question becomes -- I think, you know, overwhelmingly the case law says the contract amount doesn't come in. The -- the amount of the insurance contract doesn't come in where that's not in dispute. But the issue that we have is whether you want to tell the jury -- you want us to tell the jury about the offset amount and have them apply the offset, meaning they come to a full-value determination after the offset is applied, or if Your Honor would prefer, that the jury listens to all the evidence, reaches a conclusion on the value, and then after that Your Honor applies the offset that we've stipulated to. And we wanted to put -- we have the stipulation in place but for the language on the offset because we didn't want to get that -- we didn't want to do it -- and I know in the past, the cases I have experience with, you've had the offset applied by Your Honor and you don't -- you know, they don't hear the contract amount or the setoff amount. They just make a value determination.

THE COURT: Right. Because that's really what this case comes down to entirely, is a value determination; correct?

MS. TEMPLE: Yes. And that would eliminate a lot of the jury instructions that we would need. Because we're not really talking about -- at the heart of it we're not really talking about a breach of the contract from a -- from

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2:17-cv-01778-JAD-DJA - May 21, 2021

Mr. Humes' perspective for sure, but we're more talking -- it would be very similar to a negligence case as far as the instructions, the value, the damages, the -- and, you know, I -- I think we kind of e-mailed back and forth a little bit, but -- and I don't want to speak for counsel, but I think we're both kind of okay with either way for the offset. Personally, I think it would be easier to let the jury make the full-value determination and not hear the amount of the offset and, you know, of course not hear the amount of the insurance contract and just say this is what we think it's worth and here's the award, and then Your Honor after can apply what we've stipulated to as the offset. **THE COURT:** Any objections to that? MS. XIDIS: Well, I think that it's a matter of how it's going to -- to come down so that we don't end up causing jury confusion.

My first concern is that I don't know that the -- the amount of the policy of the coverage should be excluded. I mean, it's part of the contract. This is a breach of contract case. I mean, obviously I'm not going to be getting up there pounding my chest about a million dollars in coverage, but it is a background fact that -- that there's no reason to exclude.

With respect to the offsets, the hard part there, I don't have a problem with the --

THE COURT: Wait. Hold on one second. It's a 1 2 million-dollar policy? 3 MS. XIDIS: A million dollars of UIM coverage. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 5 MS. XIDIS: With respect to the offsets, I think it 6 would be easiest if the Court did the deductions after the 7 fact. My -- my problem and how -- what I'm having trouble 8 resolving -- and so any input is -- is more than welcome -- is 9 while it would be easy to -- to address the MedPay by just not 10 talking about it, the fact that in order to establish an 11 underinsured event, even if it's stipulated to, which it's 12 not, you have to talk about the tortfeasor's policy limits of 13 \$100,000. So that number's in the jury's mind saying, well, 14 he already got paid this much. 15 So we have to address what they're going to do with 16 that in a clear way that avoids a double deduction. And 17 whether that's through a jury instruction or a verdict form or 18 a combination of the two that gives that clear instruction, 19 that's my concern, is that even if the Court's doing that 2.0 deduction, the jury needs to -- to have a clear instruction 21 that that's already handled. Either that or we let the jury 22 do the deduction. 23 THE COURT: And I -- I think that in a prior case 24 that I had essentially what happened was the parties sort of 25 agreed to affixion, and that's almost how it has to operate,

2.0

2:17-cv-01778-JAD-DJA - May 21, 2021

is that there's affixion and that it's not so much UM/UIM coverage. It's just sort of, hey, the only question we need you people to decide here is the value of these injuries.

So if you -- if you agree that that's where we're at, then the language of the policy doesn't matter. Then however much he got from somebody else doesn't matter. What we call this coverage doesn't matter. So you have to kind of do it in a more generic way, but you have to sort of stipulate that that's how you're going to do it and you're going to -- so I think it was presented as a valuation issue and that the jury is only being asked to determine what the value of this -- this -- these injuries are. And then the parties essentially stipulate that what that means is, if it's over X amount, it's a plaintiff's verdict and, if it's below X amount, it's a defense verdict.

So you -- you can put questions to the jury that are that narrow, and that really streamlines things. But -- and it stops them from having to come up with, you know, understanding UM/UIM coverage or offsets. But if you can't come up with a -- sort of a targeted, narrow issue for the jury to decide and then stipulate what that means if they decide one way or the other, then unfortunately we do have to do it the much more complicated way and present all of these pieces.

MS. XIDIS: Okay.

MS. TEMPLE: Can I address one issue?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. TEMPLE: I -- I would have briefed this. This stipulation has been circulated. I provided this stipulation well in advance. This is my first time hearing that counsel was wanting to bring up the contract amount. That part, I don't know of any case law in any jurisdiction in the country that says that, if the contract amount isn't in dispute in a first-party case, in a breach of contract case, that the contract amount comes in. And I see why they want it in. They want to say a million dollars, a million dollars, a million dollars, but that pre-suggests an amount to the jury and that's why the overwhelming case law says, unless the terms of the contract are in dispute, that amount doesn't come in.

So regardless of what we do with the offset, I'm a little taken aback by the suggestion that that would even come into evidence because, I mean, I didn't know that that was even a consideration.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'll let you both continue to have conversations about that. I would see that just -- I mean, I don't want to prejudge an issue, but it would be a relevancy issue. And so it would be subject to 401, 402, and 403. And for a 403, bringing in an issue like that would have to be substantially -- would have to be -- have a substantial

risk of prejudice over probative. So that's what you're 1 2 looking at probably. That's how I would frame the issue. 3 It's not a case law situation; it's a relevancy issue. So 4 it's an evidentiary issue. 5 MS. TEMPLE: And I guess my issue with it would be, 6 if the contract amount isn't -- if we've stipulated a contract 7 amount that -- why would it be relevant here? Why would the 8 jury need to hear the amount? 9 THE COURT: Right. And I'm not going to prejudge 10 that right now. Hopefully you guys can work through that over 11 the weekend. And if not and you need to move to exclude the 12 policy value, then you can raise that and we'll -- we'll deal 13 with it. MS. TEMPLE: Okay. Thank you. 14 15 THE COURT: I'll make a ruling on that. But, I mean, 16 I don't know which way that would go at this point. 17 MS. TEMPLE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: Sure. 18 19 So, anyway, it looks like you have a lot of work cut 20 out for you for the weekend, and this stipulation seems to be a big chunk of it, narrowing the issues. And I am completely 21 22 comfortable presenting to the jury kind of a single issue, and 23 that's fine with me as long as you-all stipulate to what it 24 means when the jury comes back that way. That -- in a civil 25 case, that verdict form can look like a lot of different

```
things. And so if the verdict form just says, you know, we
 1
 2
      find that he has damages in the amount of whatever, I think we
 3
      can -- I suspect that you-all agree he had some damages, and
 4
      so it wouldn't be prejudicial to say how much are his damages,
 5
      which presumes there are some damages, but then that number
 6
      controls who wins and why. But you need to then -- the
 7
      stipulation needs to explain sort of that flowchart about what
 8
      happens if it's a number X over X. So -- and just for my --
 9
      to gauge my understanding here, was it -- was it 100 that he
10
      got from the tortfeasor?
               MS. XIDIS: Yes.
11
12
               THE COURT: And then the five on med?
              MS. XIDIS: Yes.
13
14
               THE COURT: From this policy?
15
              MS. TEMPLE: Yes, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: All right. Got it. All right. So, you
17
      know, however you come out on this is fine with me. Obviously
18
      it's easier for the jury if it's very streamlined and easy.
19
      The more jury instructions you have, the harder -- the more
2.0
      chance of confusion. So the narrow -- more narrow the issues,
21
      the easier this case becomes for a jury to decide.
22
              MR. ROGERS: Agreed.
23
               THE COURT: How many witnesses do we have?
24
              MS. XIDIS: Plaintiff has likely -- likely nine.
25
               THE COURT:
                           Um-hum. And defense?
```

MS. TEMPLE: Three, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Great. All right. Do we think we're 3 going to be able to get this -- so knowing that I'm not going 4 to be there on Tuesday and so it's just Monday -- and by the 5 way, Monday, with just needing to get eight people in the 6 seats, I think we could be possibly -- we should plan that we 7 may be starting openings before lunch. So just know that that 8 might happen. 9 And then we'll need to make sure that we have 10 witnesses ready to go on Monday because we'll get on as many 11 as we possibly can on Monday. 12 And so, knowing all of that, are we going to finish 13 this case within those four court days next week? MS. XIDIS: Yes. Even -- even with the nine 14 15 witnesses, I'm planning on finishing early, shortly after 16 lunch on Wednesday. 17 THE COURT: Great. 18 MS. TEMPLE: Unfortunately, Your Honor, I'm not as 19 optimistic. With seven before-and-after witnesses, two 2.0 medical experts, and the plaintiff, I just -- I can't imagine 21 being done that soon with --22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MS. TEMPLE: -- all of that cross-examination. 24 THE COURT: All right. How much extra time do you 25 think your three witnesses will be?

1 MS. TEMPLE: My three witnesses? I mean, very, very 2 short for two and then our medical expert. Our medical expert is the main one. So probably, what, a half day? 3 4 MR. ROGERS: Oh, at most. Yeah. We'll be done in a 5 half day or less with the direct. And maybe the cross as 6 well. 7 THE COURT: Okay. We're going to finish this trial 8 next week. It is going to happen in four days. We are going 9 to make sure of it, and I am not shy to move things along. So 10 we're going to get through this, and we're going to do it 11 quickly. And so I will -- I'm pretty comfortable letting the 12 jury -- I will tell the jury that there's the potential that 13 they would have to come back the following Tuesday. I just 14 want to make sure we don't have any severe scheduling 15 situations. I think the following Monday is Memorial Day, so 16 that's why it would be the Tuesday. 17 I'd like to screen out any significant scheduling 18 problems in case something crazy happens, like the fact that 19 they test the fire alarms in this building every night at 20 6:00. So that means I really can't keep a jury deliberating 21 past 6:00. So insanity like that happens. 22 And I'm just going to let everyone know, so we just 23 finished a trial last night in here, and the computer systems, 24 the monitors only work a portion of the time. So we ended up

going to paper exhibits on the ELMO, and we have a drop-down

25

screen that the jury can see. So just know that we can go old 1 2 school and we can manage it that way -- and I understand we 3 did get binders. So I know that we've got your exhibits. 4 But just know that it may not go smoothly with the 5 technology, and we now expect in this room anything that can 6 go wrong from an electronic perspective will. So just be 7 prepared that that may be the case. Microphones go out. The 8 screens in the jury box only worked part of the time. And so 9 sometimes we couldn't even do the connections between the, 10 like, laptops to be able to broadcast things. So, anyway, 11 just expect that may be the case. 12 We're trying real hard to get it fixed because we 13 should have it fixed, but in the event that it isn't, just 14 know that we may have to go to plan B, which would be paper. 15 MR. ROGERS: Got it. 16 MS. TEMPLE: Um-hum. THE COURT: Okay. Anything else, Danielle, while 17 18 we're here? COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: No, Your Honor. 19 2.0 THE COURT: Max, anything you can think of? 21 MR. ALDERMAN: No, Judge. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Amber, anything I'm missing? No? 23 Okay. 24 All right. Well, we will see everyone. Please get 25 here about 8:45 and be ready to go at 8:45 on Monday. What

2:17-cv-01778-JAD-DJA - May 21, 2021

happens when we get the jury -- the people that show up, a couple things sometimes happen. Sometimes we'll get a questionnaire and a person who hasn't responded yet but they finally respond on the day they're supposed to show up and we get their questionnaire that day, and so you'll have their questionnaire to take a look at first thing.

When the people show up with Summer and she gets the full list of everybody who's here, she then randomizes that list. So this list we have right now in 1 through 60-whatever order is going to get shuffled. So we'll have new numbers for these people, and what we'll want to do is just reorganize based on the new list. So it will be the same, for the most part, questionnaires, but we're going to have to put them in a different order. So expect that you'll need a little bit of time to do that. I think it just took me about 10 to 15 minutes the other day to do that for about 70 people. So it shouldn't take too long, but it is something you'll need to do before we start with jury selection.

At jury selection, I ask the -- I ask the questions.

I'll allow you some very limited follow up but only follow up.

And so once I've gone through all my questions -- and, again,

I'm not going to go back over what is asked in the

questionnaires unless I, too, need to follow up on something

in the questionnaires. And I will. I have a lot of yellow

tabs that I'm going to be following up on. Some of them were

the ones that you both raised today. So we'll -- we'll talk 1 2 through all of those, but I'll also allow you to do about ten 3 minutes of follow up when I'm done. 4 Any other questions? You were on your feet. 5 MS. TEMPLE: I just have these, too, to go with the 6 exhibits. They're the original transcripts, so I would assume 7 the Court needs those, too? 8 THE COURT: Yes. Those -- those stay with Danielle. 9 MS. TEMPLE: Perfect. Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Yes. All right. Anything else? 11 MR. WILSON: Briefly, Your Honor. With respect to 12 the organization of the new -- newly shuffled jury 13 questionnaires, if we show up let's say at 8:30, is it 14 possible we could get those, we could organize them so as not 15 to waste the time once we open at 8:45? 16 THE COURT: Yeah. It sort of depends on when Summer 17 gets those to us. And so we can't be entirely sure exactly 18 what time she's going to be up here, but it's usually between 19 8:30 and 8:45, so... 2.0 MR. WILSON: I was just gonna say, I'll plan on 21 showing up just a smidge early so we could take care of that 22 so we don't have an overlap whenever the Court wants to get 23 going. THE COURT: Perfect. 24 25 MS. TEMPLE: And, Your Honor, it sounds like I might

```
have to file an emergency motion if we can't work it out.
 1
 2
      would we be able to have that handled that morning, or would
 3
      we do it before -- I just want to make sure my opening doesn't
 4
      include anything that --
 5
               THE COURT: Yes.
 6
               MS. TEMPLE: -- Your Honor rules on.
 7
               THE COURT: We'll deal with it in the morning.
 8
               MS. TEMPLE: Perfect. Thank you, Your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. All right, everyone. I will
10
      see you on first thing Monday morning. And before that,
11
      though, 5:00 p.m. Sunday is the deadline for the jury
12
      instructions, please, or a stipulation and jury instructions.
13
      So even if you stipulate that it's going to be Nevada law
14
      for -- for these -- for this claim, not South Dakota law, so
15
      that it makes it easier for you to put together the jury
16
      instructions, I still need to know what do you agree on and
17
      what don't you agree on. So having a package of we absolutely
18
      agree on these things so nobody has to really worry about
19
      these would be great, and then the other pieces would be the
2.0
      and plaintiff proposes and then defendant proposes and we
21
      can't agree on.
22
               Danielle?
23
               COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: Do you want them e-mailed
      to me in Word format?
24
25
               THE COURT: Oh yes. And if you could please also
```

1	e-mail those to Danielle in Word so that, if I need to edit
2	them, I can do that.
3	MR. ROGERS: Can do.
4	MS. TEMPLE: All right. Thank you.
5	THE COURT: Okay. And if this case resolves over the
6	weekend, please let Danielle know.
7	MR. ROGERS: Great. Will do.
8	THE COURT: Thanks, everybody.
9	(Proceedings adjourned at 2:17 p.m.)
LO	000
L1	COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
L2	
L3	I, AMBER M. McCLANE, Official Court Reporter, United
L 4	States District Court, District of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada,
L 5	do hereby certify that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 753 the
L 6	foregoing is a true, complete, and correct transcript of the
L7	proceedings had in connection with the above-entitled matter.
L 8	
L 9	DATED: 6/3/2021
20	
21	/s/ Imber M. McClane AMBER MOCLANE, RPR, CRR, CCR #914
22	AMBER MOCLANE, RPR, CRR, CCR #914
23	
24	
25	